

juriously affect its quality and strength. It was further adulterated in that water had been substituted in part for clams, which the article purported to be. Further adulteration was alleged in that certain valuable constituents of the article had been in part abstracted therefrom.

On April 10, 1920, the defendant entered a plea of guilty to the information, and the court imposed a fine of \$25.

E. D. BALL, *Acting Secretary of Agriculture.*

**8174. Misbranding of Bourbon Hog Cholera Remedy. U. S. \* \* \* v. 3 Gallon Packages and 12 Quart Bottles, More or Less, of Bourbon Hog Cholera Remedy. Default decree of condemnation, forfeiture, and destruction. (F. & D. No. 11375. I. S. No. 7376-r. S. No. C-1492.)**

On September 29, 1919, the United States attorney for the Northern District of Ohio, acting upon a report by the Secretary of Agriculture, filed in the District Court of the United States for said district a libel for the seizure and condemnation of a certain quantity of a certain article, labeled in part "Bourbon Hog Cholera Remedy," at New Bremen, Ohio, alleging that the article had been shipped on or about September 3, 1919, by the Bourbon Remedy Co., Lexington, Ky., and transported from the State of Kentucky into the State of Ohio, and charging misbranding in violation of the Food and Drugs Act, as amended.

Analysis of a sample of the article by the Bureau of Chemistry of this department showed that it consisted of an acid aqueous solution containing essentially aloes, copper sulphate, ferrous sulphate, magnesium sulphate, and free sulphuric acid, flavored with safrol and colored with a red aniline dye.

Misbranding of the articles was alleged in substance in the libel for the reason that certain statements appearing on the cartons enclosing, the folder accompanying, and on the labels of the packages containing the article, regarding its curative or therapeutic effects, falsely and fraudulently represented that the article was effective as a remedy for cholera, worms, scours, coughs, and thumps in hogs, and as a powerful internal germicide, whereas, in truth and in fact, it was not effective.

On January 3, 1920, no claimant having appeared for the property, judgment of condemnation and forfeiture was entered, and it was ordered by the court that the product be destroyed by the United States marshal.

E. D. BALL, *Acting Secretary of Agriculture.*

**8175. Misbranding of Bourbon Hog Cholera Remedy. U. S. \* \* \* v. 3 Gallon Packages, 3 Half-gallon Packages, and 3 Quart Bottles, More or Less, of Bourbon Hog Cholera Remedy. Default decree of condemnation, forfeiture, and destruction. (F. & D. No. 11376. I. S. No. 7379-r. S. No. C-1497.)**

On September 29, 1919, the United States attorney for the Northern District of Ohio, acting upon a report by the Secretary of Agriculture, filed in the District Court of the United States for said district a libel for the seizure and condemnation of a certain quantity of a certain article, labeled in part "Bourbon Hog Cholera Remedy," at Kenton, Ohio, alleging that the article had been shipped on or about September 3, 1919, by the Bourbon Remedy Co., Lexington, Ky., and transported from the State of Kentucky into the State of Ohio, and charging misbranding in violation of the Food and Drugs Act, as amended.

Analysis of a sample of the article by the Bureau of Chemistry of this department showed that it consisted of an acid aqueous solution containing essentially aloes, copper sulphate, ferrous sulphate, magnesium sulphate, and free sulphuric acid, flavored with safrol and colored with aniline dye.

Misbranding of the article was alleged in substance in the libel for the reason that certain statements appearing on the cartons enclosing, the folder accompanying, and on the labels of the packages containing the article, regarding its curative or therapeutic effects, falsely and fraudulently represented that the article was effective as a remedy for cholera, worms, scours, cough, and thumps in hogs, and as a powerful internal germicide, whereas, in truth and in fact, it was not effective.

On January 3, 1920, no claimant having appeared for the property, judgment of condemnation and forfeiture was entered, and it was ordered by the court that the product be destroyed by the United States marshal.

E. D. BALL, *Acting Secretary of Agriculture.*

**S176. Misbranding of Milks Emulsion. U. S. \* \* \* v. 5 $\frac{1}{2}$  Dozen Bottles, Large Size, and 8 $\frac{1}{2}$  Dozen Bottles, Small Size, of Milks Emulsion. Default decree of condemnation, forfeiture, and destruction. (F. & D. No. 11400. I. S. No. 15145-r, 15146-r. S. No. E-1806.)**

On or about October 11, 1919, the United States attorney for the District of Delaware, acting upon a report by the Secretary of Agriculture, filed in the District Court of the United States for said district a libel praying for the seizure and condemnation of a certain quantity of an article, labeled in part "Milks Emulsion," remaining unsold in the original unbroken packages at Wilmington, Del., alleging that the article had been shipped on or about July 23, 1919, by the Milks Emulsion Co., Terre Haute, Ind., and transported from the State of Indiana into the State of Delaware, and charging misbranding in violation of the Food and Drugs Act, as amended.

Analysis of a sample of the article by the Bureau of Chemistry of this department showed that it consisted essentially of petrolatum, with small amounts of glycerin, sugar, and methyl salicylate.

Misbranding of the article was alleged in substance in the libel in that certain statements on the label on the bottle containing, and in the booklets accompanying the article, regarding the curative or therapeutic effects of the article, falsely and fraudulently represented the article to be effective as a remedy for dyspepsia, indigestion, catarrh of the stomach and bowels, bronchial asthma, catarrhal croup, bronchitis, coughs due to sore throat, pneumonia, and incipient consumption; to strengthen the digestive organs, enrich the blood, and increase the flesh; to give relief in curable throat, lung, stomach, and bowel troubles, clean and heal the afflicted parts and enable the machinery of the body to do its work properly, thus restoring strength and flesh and contributing to perfect health; in the ills of children to build up their system, enrich their blood, improve the appetite, strengthen the throat, lungs, and stomach, and to relieve and prevent catarrhal croup, whereas, in truth and in fact, it was not effective.

On December 20, 1920, no claimant having appeared for the property, judgment of condemnation and forfeiture was entered, and it was ordered by the court that the product be destroyed by the United States marshal.

E. D. BALL, *Acting Secretary of Agriculture.*

**S177. Misbranding of Uro-Lisina Johnson. U. S. \* \* \* v. 3 Dozen Bottles of Uro-Lisina. Default decree of condemnation, forfeiture, and destruction. (F. & D. No. 11412. I. S. No. 17070-r. S. No. E-1776.)**

On October 14, 1919, the United States attorney for the District of Porto Rico, acting upon a report by the Secretary of Agriculture, filed in the District Court of the United States for said district a libel for the seizure and condemnation of 3 dozen bottles of Uro-Lisina Johnson, remaining in the